

# WHAT MEDIA WANTS FROM A RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MILITARY?

Anela Ramić \*

UDK: 070.1:355.1  
316.77:355.1

Pregledni rad

Primljeno: 15. V. 2015.

Prihvaćeno: 12. X. 2015.

*We didn't want to be in bed with the military, but we certainly wanted to be there.*

Marjorie Miller, editor of the *Los Angeles Times*

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines the military-media relationship and how effective relations between the military and the media are a weapon in a media-intensive war. Also, paper examines evolution of military media relations through various conflicts over the last 150 years. Media and military have very opposite cultures and thus very complicated relation between them. Their different cultures make relation and interaction between two organizations very challenging on many issues and neither side does not understand and can't understand each other which in the long run effects their cooperation. Both of them heavily depend on public support and approval for their actions or reporting. This paper will analyse each organization separately, their relations with each other and what are benefits or negative effects that they draw from that relation and also it will pinpoint what are key steps that need to be done to achieve maximum benefit from this relation. Also the paper will look into historical issues, current problems and what are the future problems and solutions for this relation in order to work.

*Key words:* media, military, public, relationship, intelligence, government, interaction.

## INTRODUCTION

*Unless we are prepared to fight the media war fairly but with every resource at our command, we will effectively surrender that vital ground to the enemy.*

Wing Commander H. H. Pyper

Many realize the media can be a weapon of war. Military needs to control the information it is of utmost importance for the security of operation. Military culture

---

\* Anela Ramić (anelaramic@yahoo.com) je magistra političkih znanosti i profesorica književnosti iz Sarajeva, Bosna i Hercegovina.

must make more of an effort to engage in process of cooperation with the media thus making sure that only right information passes through to the public.

Duke of Wellington has a very serious objection on media and military relation: ...English newspapers... accurately stated, not only the regiments occupying a position, but the number of men fit for duty of which each regiment was composed; and the intelligence must have reached the enemy... at a moment at which it was most important that he should not receive it (Sheppard 1907: 571).

Main objective of media is to sell their product to the largest public possible while military is focused on fighting for the political, strategically or military objectives. As a branch of a government military has a difficult task of gaining support from the public and in majority of the cases war is not a popular option in public opinion. Taylor is determined to establish differences between media and military, "the military demands team play... is hierarchical... values loyalty and confidence in superiors... are average guys valuing anonymity, whereas journalists fight with one another... have no rank... value objectivity and skepticism and strive for recognition" (Taylor 1998: 272). Differences between groups are very likely to counter each other when they are in close proximity or when they need to establish cooperation. Modern developments have represented military in very good and optimistic light, but for the media it is also important to report on some darker developments that happened on the battlefield or in military structure' (Hooper 1982: 69).

Understanding and analyzing differences, connections and codependency between the two groups and their effect on the population it can bring them closer together and improve their relationship (Bless 2007: 20). Examples in literature, media of military relations will provide better understanding for the current problems they are facing also it can help them develop some sort of pattern for the future of their relations so they can improve it.

This paper will try to shorten the gap between two organizations where military could use media for their advantage and on the other side where media could benefit from the better interactions with military; conclusion of this paper will suggest different approaches for the both sides in order to maximize the benefit from their relation and interaction during the war and peacetime. Point of these approaches is to maximize strategic use of media for the military benefit while keeping the journalism honest and true. Examples of very good media use for the military will be included in the paper in order to justify it from military strategic point of view.

## THE HISTORY OF MEDIA – MILITARY RELATIONS

*Journalists will say that war is too important to be left to generals. Reporting of war is too important to be left to reporters. Soldiers need to get involved in this.*

Maj Gen Patrick Brady, former Public Relations Chief of US Army

The U.S. military has one of the most controversial relation with media ever since 19<sup>th</sup> century one constant is that they have been very close in the best and in the worst moments of their relation. Since 19<sup>th</sup> century relation have gone through several stages: censorship, openness, controlled access, and cooperation. Changing military goals and strategy combined with Medias fluid behavior forces this relation to evolve into fifth stage: “engagement” (Caldwell 2009: 10). Mexican War (1846–1848) was the first media coverage of the war in US. At that time telegraph was the most advanced communication technology and battle reports were easily broadcasted to the public it also gave reporters opportunity to ask president for his opinion (Neuman 1995: 29). The Crimean war (1854–1856) is the first that was directly covered from the battle field with extensive details. War correspondent for the *Times* William Howard Russell was the reporter from the battlefield that in detail described all horrific developments of the war. Russell refused to follow British forces and decided to walk alone on the battlefield. It was the first time ever that public knew what is the actual situation on the battlefield and for the first time British military faced criticism from the public. Russell and other correspondents were very real in describing the events and that led to the high dissatisfaction in the public for the war and also how were the troops threatened on that front.

The reportage of the war had two huge impacts: the first was that there was a major review of the British forces medical services; the second was its contribution to the fall of Prime Minister Aberdeen’s government in January 1855.

After about ten years later, more precisely during the Civil War, widespread complaints over violation of what we now call operational security surfaced. War Secretary Edwin Stanton is the first man to tried to establish control over the media reporting he, “seized newspapers that were too liberal with military information, while manipulating others into publishing false reports” (Porch 1995: 87). Journalists from both: the Union and Confederate sides were afforded great freedoms in the pursuit of stories from the front with little in the way of restrictions imposed on them by the military.

During the World War I London and Berlin tried more to control the media rather than using its potential to their benefit. German reporters were completely depended on information provided to them by the Kriegspresseamt (War Press Office). While on the other side British had different approach with same results the Defense of the Realm Act enacted on Aug 8<sup>th</sup> 1914, restricted the information that was allowed to be published to the brother public, breaking the law carried very high punishment.

World War II was a different story for the media reporters accepted restrictions and censorship just to get access to the battlefield. World War II saw the beginning

of journalists 'embedding' for extended periods of time with frontline units, heavily dependent on the military and did not possess the ability to transmit reports themselves.

Korean War was a very similar to the World War II reporters accepted censorship but this time for a different reason they did not want to endanger operations security. In the end of the Korean War media – military relation was at his highest concerning the cooperation at least from one side setting the stage for Vietnam War.

US military involvement in Vietnam was not so extensive from the beginning it was done in several stages and in the beginning there was no need for press censorship. Because of the military's weak involvement in the beginning reporters received never before seen freedom to actually report what is going on in the Vietnam. For the first time journalist had unrestricted access to the stories, troops and developments (Caldwell 2009: 12). During the Vietnam War Americans will receive double sided reports of their military's success and failures in the battlefield. At that time there was no cable TV so general population only had access to the ABC, CBC and NBC networks. Reports from Vietnam were 3 minutes long. On the other side anti-war protestors in US received much more media time. For the first time during the war protesters had a chance to present their case to the brother public. By the end of the war because of these developments and in general tension over the Vietnam War media – military relations was at the very low level.

During the Gulf War (1990–1991), very few media embedded with military units. However, some of the most crucial battles of the entire war were almost lost to history because there was no press coverage. The US military was determined to keep a tight leash on the media but wanted to exert this control as subtly as possible. But, the public had never seen images like this before and it was compelling television.

Haiti and Somalia conflicts resulted in a great shift in media coverage, but the Balkan Wars are the first time example of true cooperation between military and media and in more modern situation War on Terrorism will develop this relation further. Second invasion of Iraq contributed to more integration of the media. Military finally realized that controlling the media access to the battlefield was much harder and perhaps with more cooperation they can still filter sensitive information from the general public. There are also other elements that are influencing this relation as it can be seen from former U.S. Army officer about the goals of the embed program:

We wanted to neutralize the disinformation efforts of our adversaries. We wanted to build and maintain support for U.S. policy as well as the global war on terrorism. We wanted to take offensive action to achieve information dominance. We wanted to be able to demonstrate the professionalism of the U.S. military. And we wanted to build and maintain support, of course, for the war fighter out there on the ground (Shepard 2004: 11, 12).

Modern media technological evolution has brought new challenges to media – military relation. Media is so much influential and present in modern times. Media

has expanded in every sector from their presence on the battlefield to their very fast information transfer directly from that battlefield. Impact of modernization has resulted that there is no absolute control of media access in the war zone. Using computers, mobile phones and other technologies gives opportunity for ordinary people to take a video or picture and give insight in the developments. Consider, for example, the role new media played in protests over the recent Iranian elections. Traditional media were nearly shut out. But the problem for Iran's government was that "Web 2.0," enabled protester to send their message through entire world even with very high level of censorship from Iran's government.

Internet has created a very high connection between the people and so is the information transfer much higher. Current social media influence can force military to rethink their relation towards the media (Caldwell 2009: 13).

Coverage of the current conflict is constant and there is no stooping that but effects of the reports and the stories is much weaker. It can be said that military involvement in media carry's now less risk than before. It is very likely that current military position towards media is very stable and major scandal has to happen before there is significant backlash from the public opinion.

## THE MILITARY ACHILLES HEEL: PROVIDING PUBLIC SUPPORT

*It is no longer possible for a free country to fight even a limited war in a world of modern communications, with reporters and television cameras on the battlefield against the feelings and wishes of the people.*

James Reston, *New York Times*

Eric Arthur Blair better known as George Orwell during the Spanish Civil War and World War II had opportunity to see from first hand worst war crimes from the fascists. Orwell's point of view that during the large period of time human existence will come to the state of human working drones that will be controlled by the propaganda, security agencies and brain washing, and this has become a road sign and explanation to all of those that are in search of the truth.

According to Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia* leftist publications like *News Chronicle* and *Daily Worker* had very subtly hidden the truth from the British public about the struggles during the Spanish Civil War and what actually happened? Fact that newspapers have bent the truth about fears of Spanish government, that they feared revolution more than fascists. Censorship of newspapers, banning the political parties, constant espionage and forceful political arrests has become everyday occurrence during the Spanish Civil War.

Medias influence on public opinion against or on behalf of military started with Spanish – American War. William Randolph Hearst, owner of the *New York Journal*, was very supportive of US intervention in Cuba. With skilled use of persons like Hearst and his media military hierarchy in government can gain very high public support

for their cause. With this kind of behavior public support for the cause should be constant; going into the military operation or war before securing public support is very reckless and it can leave long term consequences in society and create mistrust towards military. If hostilities are started and continued before gaining the support from the media is considered highly inadvisable. Public opinion and debate is, it could say, run not by events but by the coverage of events. In majority of the cases public opinion and reaction is actually media opinion, because Medias are the ones who chose how to tell that information to the larger public. It did without doubt impact upon the decisions taken by the military. First Iraq invasion is good example of this on 27 February 1991 in the beginning of the ground offensive, one of the key battles happened to speed up Iraq's retreat from the Kuwait. CNN report from that warzone was very excessive and it displayed a picture of much more casualties than there actually were. That kind of reporting and misrepresentation of actual developments influenced political leadership to stop further operations and effected the strategy of campaign. It will never be determined what are the short and long term consequences of that reporting it stooped military conflict but without actually achieving all strategic goals that were set in the beginning of the campaign. Maybe if the campaign was finished to the end some preventive actions would have been taken and there would be no need for Second Iraq invasion.

Modern nations are very secure in their survival and conflicts of choice are becoming more common and so there is very high pressure on the outcomes of these conflicts. Shaw sees this as "globality... a distinguishing feature of our age where... a common consciousness of human society exists on a world scale" (Shaw 2000: 11,12). Connection between cause of the conflict, public and government is becoming more important because modern conflicts are becoming more expensive in every aspect, human casualties on the battlefield cannot be justified to the public if the goal of the operation is not supported by the same public, governments need to justified their cause for the hostilities it is one of the first objectives even before going into the war. In recent couple of years reporters are becoming more targeted on the front if they are military personnel clear examples of that are Syria and Iraq. In 2012, 121 reporters lost their life (Sengupta 2013: 30, 31). Journalist Sayed Pervez Kambaksh was sentenced to death in Afghanistan and only by intervention of US and British government he was released this is one of the examples how much danger are journalist facing in modern warfare, he was secretly released in 2009. Journalist receive high public support due to their bravery and sacrifices they make so they can report actual news and facts.

Public support hold individuals accountable for their actions and in the end justice will be done in one way or another in long term it helps saves life, but no matter how high public support is for some cause human casualties are always hard to accept. There is also contradiction in public, they will always have hard time accepting loss of life while at the same time one of the most visited sites on internet are jihadi beheadings and also Apache helicopter gunships is released showing insurgents being neutralized. Western media tries to avoid showing these videos while Al Jazeera does it to report on terms of the terrorist (Tumber and Webster 2006: 38).

Lack of fear for national security has put high pressure on actual strategic goals and do to this governments are trying connect these goals directly to the survival of the country. That is very hard to do because in majority of the cases invading the foreign country has very little to do with protecting your own territory. It is a very gentle dance between reality and fiction of national security. First World War was very specific at that time elections were one by diplomatic efforts of the governments at that time they did not use military capability's or conquest as means of gaining the votes. While Second World War had a very different story Hitler used warmongering ideology to gain support from the German population and also on the other side US and UK governments were very much depended on their success through the war if they wanted to stay in power. Situation in US went to that extreme that President Roosevelt was elected for four terms which was never before seen or possible by US constitution but it was changed for him. Paralels can be easily drawn between developments during the World War II and situation in Iraq and Afghanistan if the UK and US governments wanted to survive they needed successful completion of these operations. In the modern time budget cuts to the defense are in rare cases popular in public opinion in majority of the cases they are portrayed as weakness of current government and eventually lead to their downfall. Second World War was very specific it was fought for a basic survival of their way of life and media played a huge part in governments propaganda machine by their influence they had to keep moral of civil population high and from that time public has become more depended on media to provide them with information giving the media very huge power (Braman 2003: 148). Such development had put military in very difficult position because reporting on them by a certain media would result in public opinion, if they decided to report in negative light it would mean disaster. Support for the military has been constant for a very long time and nothing has been able to change that but in modern times media is the only factor that can influence that. Media will always focus diplomacy, politics and military because it will interest public the most while on the other side public will always focus their attention towards military issues even if they had never experienced a day of military service. There is interesting theory of connection between media and individuals personal beliefs because majority of the public opinions is formed on their individual beliefs if the media can touch those feelings it can easily form public opinion. Factors like personality, ideology, ethnicity, occupation and interests, can interact with media programming and that is Gamson applicable "experiential knowledge" (Gamson 1992: 179). Two things are set in stone individual will always form its opinion based on personal experience and beliefs. Relation between public opinion and foreign policies of one nation is very fluid and depends on lot of factors that media presents. Direct threats to national security of western countries since the end of Cold War have been a few but any military operation still demands justification and it has been provided in terms of peace keeping mission, stopping terrorism abroad which there is a little connection to the national security so propaganda of the military along



with media has to do double the work to justify these kind of operations<sup>1</sup>. Terrifying reports from these conflicts have actually done their work and in majority of the cases media has been able to gain public support for these operation even more in some cases public has demanded action from their government. Individuals see the world as the media shows it and connecting foreign problems to their personal reasons will inspire them to force their government to action perfect example of this is US FOX TV and Second Iraq invasion. Philosophical belief is that states humanist behavior to foreign threat that do not endanger them is actually product of theirs public individuals humanity and compassion. Realist believe that governments can serv as a balancing factor and that they can prevent bad thing from happening.

Media's impact can leave long term cognitive consequences on the public. Media's advantage is that it sends visual messages that have much better chance of leaving the impact on public and the message will stay longer in individuals head. Gottschalk suggests that military can use those media methods to build up support for their goals over time in nutshell long term and subtitle influence on public opinion can acquire support for actions that are not in public interest (Gottschalk 1992: 449). This ability to influence public opinion through their personal feelings gives media a hug leverage over any objective of government. Problem for the media represents that public always demands spectacle and hard hiding stories and that is not the field where media can always deliver if they don't keep public interested in their reporting they will lose viewers and lose their power to shape public opinion, for stories to be interesting they need to be shiny to keep the person focus on it (Braman 2003: 27). In majority of the cases reporters who tell the news are attractive male of female individuals just to keep the audience focused on their channel. Ability to influence public opinion is more important to the media rater then to military, because military can still continue to function and achieve their goals even without media help. In majority of the cases media would like to present objectivity in the news rather than blind support to troops but that would not be very well received in the public. Media problem in objectivity is mostly visible while reporting from the front lines where sometimes military do not give access because they claim they are concerned over reporter's security. Military will always use safety card in their argument while journalism considers that open censorship of the media. By Braman no matter how close relation between military and media is as soon as objective reporting starts from the battlefield that relation will be in very difficult position (Braman 2003: 29). Public opinion is very important for both sides and like that demands their full attention.

In order to achieve some degree of objectivity while also getting access to the vital information key for the media is to have very good relation with military. Information provided by the media must be very streamlined so that public cannot interpret them in a different way. As military has it plans, objectives and means to

<sup>1</sup> The United Nations reports 63 operations currently in force and reports a record increase between 1989 and 1984 when 20 new operations were initiated. The total number of peace keeping troops has increased since 1989 from 11,000 to approximately 75,000. [www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/surge.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/surge.shtml) accessed on 1 May 2013.



achieve their end so does the media must start planning as if for a campaign. If the media wants to produce real, objective and comprehensive news than it need to establish cooperative relation with military so they can have access to the real information. This relation is a two way street media must at the time respect military desires and decision for security and strategically reasons, there will be always some information that are not allowed to be shared with brother public, that must be respected for the success of the operation and by doing that media is actually doing a service to the military personnel on the ground.

## EXAMPLES AND GUIDELINES TO MEDIA SUCCESS IN WAR

*The idea that we must choose between the method of "winning hearts and minds" and the method of shaping behavior presumes that we have the right to choose at all. This is to grant us a right that we would surely accord to no other power. Yet the overwhelming body of American scholarship accords us this right.*

Noam Chomsky, *On Anarchism*

According to Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Commander in Chief US Central Command during the Gulf War, in a work *It Doesn't Take a Hero* (Schwarzkopf 1992: 344), he issued the following guidelines to his subordinates regarding media relations:

- Don't let them intimidate you;
- There's no law that says you have to answer all their questions;
- Don't answer any question that in your judgment would help the enemy; and
- Don't ever lie to the American people.

Increased and very fast communication can sometimes bypass military filtration system and information that should never been published then become available to the public. Vietnam War was very problematic because military in majority of the cases refused to comment on some developments which fuelled more outrage in public and provoked more skepticism in the media. Idea that military is always hiding something became very popular at that time. And very important: Get back to the media with an informed response if necessary!

Media must be very careful not to use conjecture when handling very sensitive military information that can easily develop into information vacuum. Also enemy will always try to provide media with their own information (Hill 1997: 26, 27).

CNN is one of the most influential media in the world and for many years has provided reports directly from the battleground and send their reporters where majority of the networks did not. But the Gulf War was a very difficult period for them because majority of the government and population were not very pleased with their reports. Next part of the paper will analyze examples and guidelines of

war reporting also explaining the catch phrases of military personnel and in general role of the CNN in military news reporting.

According to Lt Col Norman B. Hutcherson, in *Command and Control Warfare: Putting Another Tool in the War-Fighter's Data Base* (Hutcherson 1994: 13, 14), majority of the public and military personnel were very depended on CNN reports during the Gulf War. Military should always try to use this phenomenon where large part of population depends on one media and present their information to the public. Also very important fact was that CNN was probably also only source of information for the enemy and military need to use this to present their own information to the media so it can demoralize enemy even further and perhaps bring the conflict to the speedy end. Military need to filter their information very carefully because world is much more connected that it was and even a smallest leak of a very strategically important information can go globally viral in a part of a seconds, one information is on the internet there is no pulling it back. Military can establish control by using the internet by disclosing information that they choose and thus presenting a public some sort of transparency while at the same time controlling it. These methods of filtered disclosure of sensitive information have become very common practice in US Department of Defense. This method provides advantage to the military during their press releases because they can actually prepare for the question of the media. The point of this method is not propaganda but information, by revealing some sensitive information military is actually securing strategically important information that would perhaps endanger the operation. Clausewitz's Remarkable Trinity was very important when it came down to CNN reporting during the war. First military needs media as an ally. Second media will not glorify military or make them look bad purposefully. Make media your ally and let them do their job it will make relation with them so much beneficial and easier. Very important part of media reporting during the Gulf War were military experts that were very cooperative with media. Maj Gen Perry Smith was a CNN military analyst and his book, *How CNN Fought the War: A View from the Inside*, it gives a very detail explanation of his cooperation with the media and his role in general. He will have a lot of air time to comment and explain reports and images from the battlefield. Explaining the certain report immediately has much better effect when it comes from the expert person that actually knows what is he talking about and what is going on in that situation. To keep some degree of objectivity majority of the military experts are retired military personal that has no current connection to the Department of the Defense. The military should use these experts more often and embrace their role because they are the ones that can shorten the gap between military – media – public. Military must use media power for their own benefit it need to develop some sort of campaign that will start before actual operation and continue until the goal is met and in the end through the media declare their final victory (Hill 1997: 30, 31).

The US Department of Defense published a book (*Department of Defense Law of War Manual*, 2015) of instructions on the rules of war, with details of the permitted methods of killing the enemy where it is stated that the journalists may be

terrorists. The book on 1,176 pages suggests that the shooting, explosion, bombing, stabbing and cutting the enemy are all acceptable ways to “finish the job”, but the use of poisons and gases on the other hand is not allowed. The green light is given by the sudden attack and the murder of ambushed troops are withdrawn. But extensive manual is not just about the protocol for those who are on the front line. It also has an extensive section relating to the press – including the fact that they can be labeled as terrorists. Instruction also applies to drones stating that “there is no prohibition in the law on the use of aircraft on the remote control.” Such weapons can provide a significant advantage over conventional weapons systems. The manual also states that drones can be marked as a military aircraft used by the army of a certain country.

The manual is all the more concerning given the U.S. military’s history of neglecting press freedom when addressing terrorism. During the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, U.S. forces illegally imprisoned journalists: Reuters cameraman Ibrahim Jassam, arrested in 2008 and held without charge for more than a year; Associated Press photojournalist Bilal Hussein, arrested in 2006 and held without charge for two years; and CTV Television Network journalist Jawed Ahmad, arrested in 2007 and held for 11 months. In perhaps the most notorious case, Al-Jazeera cameraman Sami al-Haj, a member of IPI’s global executive board, was illegally detained for more than six years in Guantanamo Bay, where he was tortured and questioned repeatedly about his work for Al-Jazeera.

The Law of War Manual sets a precedent for other states, including those with little interest in upholding freedom of expression. If the role of the Department of Defense is to protect democratic freedoms, suppression of the press should be antithetical to its operations. As the manual stands now, it is of little use to military commanders making decisions, and it weakens the already vulnerable position of journalists (International Press Institute, 2015).

## CONCLUSION

*Media manipulation in the U.S. today is more efficient than it was in Nazi Germany, because here we have the pretense that we are getting all the information we want. That misconception prevents people from even looking for the truth.*

Mark Crispin Miller

Media and military by their core behavior have a very different ambitions and goals also their philosophy attracts different kind of personalities into their service, their individual behavior actually is complete opposite of the other side in majority of the cases it negates it. Communication between the two groups is essential for their individual success but no matter how much productive that is military will always need media to secure public support for their causes. Relation between two sides that is established on the acceptable terms for both of them is the only way that

will bring productive results for both of them. Military is such organization that their cooperation with media must be done through their own terms because of the consequences from their actions while on the other side media is completely opposite their success and core function is to provide the public with information especially hard hiding information that will impact the public opinion. Media correspondents that actually go to the war zones and report must understand position of the military in consideration towards them, problem for the military represents that they cannot guarantee their complete safety also they cannot provide the reporters with the basic military training that is necessary for the front lines. Military must adequately manage their relation with media more precisely it need to train and prepare their personal that is in charge of media relation so they can achieve maximum benefit from their investment. This kind of approach would definitely shorten the gap between the two sides because both sides would better understand mission of the other party. Primary conclusion for the military is that they need to be more interested and invested in the media thus gaining control and ability to filter information. Modern military is in majority of the cases engaged in political military campaigns not the existential ones which stresses this question even more. Because of so many information sources sometimes military and public are confused because different information comes. So informing the public about real developments is a very hard task to do. This puts a lot of pressure on political leadership to coordinate their campaign planning with public opinion, different social climate and fast spread of information demands from them more effort so they can get the public support. Connection the national survival and political campaigns that are not actually connected to the national survival is a very challenging task to do political leadership must cooperate with military personnel in charge of media relation and devise effective strategy of connecting those two.

The media must be considerable of sensitive information's considering strategic planning and international relations, while at the same time keeping the objectivity of the reports that are in connection with military affairs. Reporters must be more educated in strategic and international goals of the campaign in order to gain their objectivity while not ruining their relation with military. Careful approach to these question would guarantee strategically important information to be secret. Military needs to accept the media and doing that in the future they also must accept responsibility for their behavior. There can never be unlimited access to the military information some degree of control over the information that are sheared must be established.

Relation between them is very coo depended in concern of gaining public support one cannot function without the other. Reports of operational activity must be in appropriate measure; military is not the just brute physical force on the battlefield. Through entire paper there are clear suggestion that relation must be professional and cooperative in order to work in every segment be that of actually fighting on the battleground or strategically – planning information.

In no way there should be any change of information but only the way that is being broadcasted to the public should be compatible with military goals and strategy. To achieve their primary goal of getting the support from public need to work on the goals of presenting military tradition in a positive light while at the same time giving a strategically and logical reason why is this operation of a great importance. This is the relation that is very depend one on another and it will continue for a long time.

According to Orwell, if the British public has given the truth about what is Spanish Civil War, it could have given a chance to learn what fascism is and how to defeat it. However, by the *News Chronicle* it was just suicidal mania, that kind of insight British public had hard time getting. According to Carl von Clausewitz – Prussian soldier and German theorist, majority of the information that is given during the war is inaccurate, lot of is contradictory and in general majority of the information is completely wrong.

Real information from the front can be only expected from the actually participants on the front in no way from the media.

## LITERATURE

- Bless, C. et al. 2007. *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*. South Africa, Juta & Co.
- Braman, E. 2003. To What End? War Reporting in the Television Age. *RUSI Journal*.
- Caldwell, B. 2009. Fostering a Culture of Engagement. *Military Review*.
- Department of Defense Law of War Manual. 2015. US Department of Defense.
- Gamson, W. 1992. *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottschalk, M. 1992. Operation Desert Cloud: The Media and the Gulf War. *World Policy Journal* 9:3.
- Hill, R. 1997. *The Future Military-Media Relationship: The Media as an Actor in War Execution*. Air Command and Staff College.
- Hooper, A. 1982. *The Military and the Media*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing.
- Hudson, M. and Stanier, John. 1997. *War and the Media*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
- Hutcherson, Norman B. 1994. *Command and Control Warfare: Putting Another Tool in the War-Fighter's Data Base*. Air University Research Report No. AU-ARI-94-1. Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press.
- International Press Institute. 2015. *Ambiguities in U.S. Law of War Manual. Pose potential threat to press freedom*. Ifex. [http://www.ifex.org/united\\_states/2015/08/24/law\\_war\\_manual/](http://www.ifex.org/united_states/2015/08/24/law_war_manual/)
- Neuman, J. 1995. *Lights, Camera, War*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Porch, D. 1995. "No Bad Stories": The American Military-Media Relationship. *Naval War College Review* 55, No. 1.
- Schwarzkopf, N. 1992. *It Doesn't Take a Hero*. New York: Bantam.
- Sengupta, K. 2013. How Telling the Truth can be Deadly for Journalists who Work in War Zones. *I newspaper*, No. 29.
- Shaw, M. 2000. *Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shepard, A. 2004. *Narrowing the Gap*. Chicago: McCormick Tribune Foundation.
- Sheppard, S. T. 1907. In Memoriam: William Howard Russell. *The United Service Magazine*, No. 940.
- Taylor, P. M. 1998. *War and the Media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tumber, H. and Webster, F. 2006. *Journalists under Fire: Information War and Journalistic Practices*. London: Sage Publications.

## ŠTO MEDIJI ŽELE U ODNOSU S VOJSKOM?

Anela Ramić

### SAŽETAK

U radu se istražuje odnos vojske i medija te utjecaj tog odnosa na intenziviranje rata. Također, rad istražuje evoluciju vojnih odnosa s medijima kroz različite sukobe u posljednjih 150 godina. Mediji i vojska imaju suprotne kulture pa je njihov odnos vrlo kompliciran. Njihove različite kulture i međusobna interakcija vrlo su izazovni u mnogim pitanjima, a to što se međusobno ne razumiju dugoročno utječe na njihovu suradnju. Vojska i mediji jako ovise o javnoj potpori i neophodno im je odobrenje za postupke ili izvještavanje. U ovom radu će se analizirati svaka organizacija zasebno, odnosi jednih s drugima, kao i prednosti ili negativni učinci koji se mogu izvući iz tog odnosa, a odredit će se i koji su ključni koraci koje je potrebno učiniti kako bi se postigla maksimalna korist iz tog odnosa. Rad će se osvrnuti i na povijesna pitanja, aktualne probleme i buduće probleme i rješenja za ovaj odnos.

Ključne riječi: mediji, vojska, javnost, veze, vlada, interakcija.